

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Final Evaluation of Satellite Index Insurance for Pastoralists in Ethiopia Programme (SIPE 2019-2022)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 88%	
<p>Overall, the Final Evaluation of Satellite Index Insurance for Pastoralists in Ethiopia (SIPE) Programme (2019-2022) presents credible and useful findings that users can rely on with a high degree of confidence for decision making. The context of the evaluation is presented in sufficient detail while the overview of the subject includes most of the relevant features. The report clearly and concisely presents the objectives and scope of the evaluation but could have explained its rationale in more detail. The methodological design, evaluation criteria, and questions are clear and fully consider GEWE dimensions. The limitations of the monitoring data are recognized. Ethical considerations, methodological limitations and mitigation strategies are fully and clearly outlined. However, other features related to sampling strategy and data sources could have been presented in greater detail. The findings are well and clearly formulated but some evaluation sub-questions were not effectively addressed. It would also have been useful to highlight unanticipated effects of the intervention more prominently. Similarly, the conclusions are formulated well but could have systematically been presented at a higher level of abstraction. Recommendations flow logically from findings; they are realistic and useful for implementers.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary presents a good overview of the context and of the SIPE as the subject of the evaluation, as well as most of the evaluation features. It fully captures the findings, conclusions, and lessons learned. However, the executive summary missed a few features, including a full description of the geographic scope, intended users, and recommendations of the evaluation. It also slightly exceeds the maximum word limit.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The context of the evaluation subject is presented in sufficient detail. The overview of the SIPE includes most of the necessary features. However, the report should have coherently and systematically discussed the planned and actual transfers and included disaggregated figures. The report could have also discussed the type of support provided by development partners and provided up-to-date budget figures by outcomes.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly and concisely presents the objectives and scope of the evaluation. Gender considerations were also mainstreamed in relation to the objectives. However, the report does not clearly provide an evaluation rationale despite including a heading to this effect.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The methodological design, evaluation criteria, and questions fully consider GEWE dimensions. The limitations of the monitoring data are recognized. The evaluation criteria, matrix, questions, and sub-questions are fully presented while the data collection methods are described in sufficient detail. The ethical considerations, limitations, and mitigation strategies are also clearly outlined. The methodology could have articulated several features more in-depth, particularly the sampling strategy and data sources. Finally, more information regarding the extent to which the previous endline evaluation informed the design and questionnaire would have been useful.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory

The findings are well formulated and presented in a manner that is clear and easy to understand. The level of evidence underpinning them is high, and triangulation is clearly established across a diverse range of the data collection methods and sources. Gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) dimensions are fully considered. The contributions of WFP are discussed whilst acknowledging limitations. Unanticipated effects of the intervention are discussed in the report but could have been highlighted more prominently in the findings. The findings also overlooked some sub-questions and included lessons learned that should have been included in a separate section. While results from previous evaluations and interventions are discussed, the level of implementation and use of relevant recommendations could have been presented.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The conclusions are clearly derived from the findings, and they capture GEWE-related issues, including in relation to sustainability. The lessons learned are not always clearly articulated in terms of their wider application and how they should be implemented. The conclusions could have been systematically presented at a higher level of abstraction.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

Recommendations are well formulated and logically structured. They are realistic, prioritized and categorized at the sub-recommendation level which enhances their utility for implementers. They could have presented their lead in more detail, to better understand the context in which they would be implemented.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

The report is well structured and adheres to WFP guidelines and templates. It is also cohesive and easy to read. Visual aids and data sources are clearly presented. The length of the report and the Annexes are appropriate. However, the report could have undergone a more thorough copy edit to fix typos and grammatical, punctuation errors.

**Integration of Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) scorecard**

<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 9 points
--	------------------------------

The report mainstreams GEWE dimensions effectively, including a dedicated evaluation criterion, main evaluation question, and several evaluation sub-questions to address these considerations. The report explains how GEWE dimensions will be assessed in the evaluation. The shortcomings of the monitoring data with respect to GEWE are also recognized in the report. The methodology fully integrates GEWE dimensions, with dedicated paragraphs discussing GEWE integration in the evaluation methods. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations adequately and comprehensively address GEWE dimensions.

**Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels**

<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the credible and useful evaluation findings provided and can use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report is considered an excellent example.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the evaluation findings provided and may use it for decision-making noting that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can use some of the learning from the evaluation, noting that there are significant gaps/ shortcomings in the evaluation findings provided. The report may still contribute to decision making but should be used with caution.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>